

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful review of this application. Claims 1-19 have been rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks submitted in support thereof.

#### **Obviousness Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Java Media Framework API Guide* (November 19, 1999) <<http://java.sun.com/products/java-media/jmf/2.1.1/guide/JMFTOC.html>> (herein referred to as “Java Guide”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,138,271 to Keeley. As will be fully explained below, the combination of Java Guide in view of Keeley does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claims 1, 9, and 17.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 define mobile multimedia framework application program interfaces (API) capable of operation in mobile hardware devices. Among other features, a memory size of the mobile multimedia framework API is less than 100 kilobytes. Furthermore, independent claim 1 defines a mobile multimedia framework API that consists of a playback interface, a control interface, an event listener interface, an error list interface, an exceptions interface, an events interface, and a protocol handler interface. Independent claims 9 and 17 define a playback interface consisting of a manager API, a package manager API, a player API, a time API, a time base API, a system time base API, and a media locator API.

In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner notes that Java Guide discloses a mobile multimedia framework API that consists of a playback interface, a control interface, an event listener interface, an error list interface, an exceptions interface, an events interface,

and a protocol handler interface, as defined in independent claim 1, and a playback interface consisting of a manager API, a package manager API, a player API, a time API, a time base API, a system time base API, and a media locator API, as defined in independent claims 9 and 17. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's characterizations in this regard because, as discussed previously in the Applicants' Amendment mailed October 29, 2004, the Examiner simply cites to elements disclosed in separate portions of the Java Guide. However, the Java Guide does not disclose anywhere that the cited elements are grouped together as defined in independent claims 1, 9, and 17, where independent claim 1 defines a mobile multimedia framework API that consists of a playback interface, a control interface, an event listener interface, an error list interface, an exceptions interface, an events interface, and a protocol handler interface, and independent claims 9 and 17 define a playback interface that consists of a manager API, a package manager API, a player API, a time API, a time base API, a system time base API, and a media locator API.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness based on a combination of references, there additionally must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references or in the knowledge generally available to one having ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references in the manner proposed. As will be explained below, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness against the claimed subject matter because one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Java Guide and Keeley in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner notes that although neither Java Guide nor Keeley teaches the memory size of the mobile multimedia framework API being less than 100 kilobytes, Keeley "teaches a modified operating system ... with limited constrain memory" and therefore, "providing small operating system is well known and

applied in the art” (see Office Action mailed April 20, 2005 at page 3). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s characterization in this regard because the portions of Keeley relied upon by the Examiner (col. 2, lines 30-32, lines 45-59; col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 15; col. 7, lines 6-14; and col. 7, line 51 – col. 8, line 3) do not suggest that having a mobile multimedia framework API that is less than 100 kilobytes is common knowledge or well-known in the art, and the portions do not provide the suggestion or motivation to combine the references in the manner proposed.

In particular, Keeley discloses that a collection of modules in the kernel “would *eliminate* the need to preselect a subset of a full featured operating system 18 for use in embedded applications” (col. 6, lines 12-14). Thus, in view of Java Guide, Keeley actually discourages the preselection of a subset of the APIs disclosed in Java Guide for use in an embedded application. Since Keeley specifically teaches that the proposed modification is undesirable, there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification, and the teachings of Java Guide and Keeley are not sufficient to render independent claims 1, 9, and 17 *prima facie* obvious.

Furthermore, in support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner also notes that Friedrich et al., *A Survey of Configurable, Component-Based Operating Systems for Embedded Applications*, IEEE May-June 2001 teach operating systems in a range from 20-26 kbytes. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s assertion because independent claims 1, 9, and 17 define *application program interfaces* and not operating systems. Furthermore, Friedrich et al. discloses “[i]t is *not clear* to what extent MMLite provides users with the ability to easily select components that the MMLite developers write, and to what extent users themselves define and utilize their own new components” (page 63). Since Friedrich et al. specifically admit that the selection of components is unclear, there is no

motivation or suggestion to group the interfaces as defined in independent claims 1, 9, and 17.

Accordingly, for the above-stated reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Java Guide in view of Keeley. Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-19, each of which depends directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1, 9, or 17, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Java Guide in view of Keeley for at least the same reasons set forth for independent claims 1, 9, and 17. As a result, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections for claims 1-19.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present request, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6924. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this request, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP011). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Michael K. Hsu, Esq.  
Reg. No. 46,782

Martine Penilla & Gencarella, LLP  
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Telephone: (408) 749-6900  
**Customer Number 32,291**